



Patent  
Attorney's Docket No. 032865-012

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of	)	<b>MAIL STOP AF</b>
Shoichi Kamano et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 2183
Application No.: 09/933,819	)	Examiner: Tonia L Meonske
Filed: August 22, 2001	)	Confirmation No.: 7236
For: DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM	)	
WITH SELECTOR FOR CONTROL	)	
SIGNALS	)	

**PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE REQUEST**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A Pre-Appeal Conference is requested to review the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. For at least the following reasons, it is believed that the outstanding rejections are clearly improper and without basis.

Overview

Claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over USP 5,093,908, hereinafter *Beacom*.

Each of the independent claims includes, among other elements, a selector that supplies one of two signals to a dedicated circuit portion. See, e.g., claim 1 :

“a selector for selectively supplying the dedicated circuit portion with selected control signals between the first control signals supplied from the sequence control portion and second control signals supplied from the general purpose data processing unit, the second control signals superseding the first control signals and

the general purpose data processing unit being able to control the dedicated circuit portion instead of instead of the sequence control portion”.

The Examiner alleges that the logic circuit 302 of *Beacom* corresponds to the claimed selector. The *Beacom* logic circuit 302 receives several inputs such as the output from the sequencer 301, the output of the exception mask register 360, and bus lines 304. If the inputs to the logic 302 meet certain conditions, the logic 302 outputs a hold signal 303. See column 6, lines 9 – 18. The hold signal is not a signal received by the logic 302, it is merely an on/off type signal to stop the control store 130 to inhibit the next word. See column 4, lines 65 – 68.

In contrast to the logic circuit 302 of *Beacom*, the selector of the present claims is clearly defined as selectively supplying the dedicated circuit portion with selected control signals that are selected from among the first control signals supplied from the sequence control portion and the second control signals supplied from the general purpose data processing unit. Claim 1 further indicates that the second control signals supersede the first control signals and the general purpose data processing unit is able to control the dedicated circuit portion instead of the sequence control portion. Thus, as now defined in claim 1, the “selector” selects from among first and second control signals.

In contrast to the claimed selector, the logic 302 of *Beacom* does not select from among a plurality of control signals. The logic 302 is only capable of outputting a single hold signal 303 if certain conditions are met. Thus, whereas the selector of claim 1 actually transfers control of the dedicated circuit portion from the sequence control portion to the general purpose data processing unit, the logic 302 of *Beacom* is merely an on/off switch. This is completely different than the claimed selector that

selectively supplies the dedicated circuit portion with selected control signals that are selected from among the first *control* signals supplied from the sequence control portion and the second *control* signals supplied from the general purpose data processing unit.

The Examiner further alleges that the hold signal 303 is subsequently supplied to the control store 130, which is part of the dedicated circuit portion. However, the element 130 is the control storage, but the control of the hold act is only used in the control of the main processor, as shown in Figure 4A.

Accordingly, *Beacom* does not teach or suggest claim 1 as amended in the last response. Similar amendments were also made to independent claims 8 and 11. The remaining claims are dependent claims that depend from one of claims 1, 8, or 11. Accordingly, all of the claims should now be in condition for allowance.

#### Conclusion


In summary, the claims clearly recite that the selector supplies the dedicated circuit portion with selected controls that are selected from among the first control signals and the second control signals. In other words, the selector is able to supply a selected one of two signals to the dedicated circuit portion. In contrast to the present invention, the portion of *Beacom* identified by the Examiner as corresponding to the claimed selector is only capable of supplying a single signal, i.e., the hold signal 303. Although the input to the logic circuit 302 comes from several sources, it does not detract from the fact that the logic circuit 302 is only capable of outputting a single signal, i.e., the hold signal 303.

For at least the reasons stated above, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness or set forth proper rejections. Therefore, the outstanding rejections cannot be allowed to stand.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: August 22, 2005

By:   
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620